



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/802,229	03/08/2001	Michaelj D. Albright	P5786	6676

7590

08/17/2004

B. Noel Kivlin
Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

CHANG, ERIC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2116

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Sk

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/802,229

Applicant(s)

ALBRIGHT ET AL.

Examiner

Eric Chang

Art Unit

2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-36 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on May 19, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that Knight does not teach or suggest "at least one switch" or "a first link between the host adaptor and the switch and a second link between the switch and the I/O device". But Knight teaches a method by which information about components and links between hosts and I/O devices are determined and added to a configuration file [col. 13, lines 36-60]. Furthermore, in an exemplary embodiment of the method, Knight teaches that links between hosts and I/O devices may be routed through intermediate hosts [FIG. 2B, and col. 8, lines 49-65]. Thus, because intermediate host performs as a routing switch, and because Knight teaches that information about such components are determined, Knight teaches the claimed invention, substantially as claimed.

4. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that Ito does not teach or suggest that the host and I/O device are in a network system. But Ito teaches a hub-based I/O network wherein a plurality of hosts and I/O devices are coupled together and communicate with each other by means of a switch [FIG. 11]. Because Knight and Ito are both directed towards the problem of analyzing and configuring the links between hosts and I/O devices in a network system, it would

Art Unit: 2116

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine their respective teachings.

Furthermore, Ito teaches that it is well known in the art that the hosts may be part of a network system [FIG. 18, and col. 2, lines 12-14].

5. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that combining Knight with Ito would defeat the intended purpose of Ito. But Knight teaches analyzing the configuration of a network [Abstract]. Ito teaches means by which hosts may access I/O devices as though it were connected to the I/O bus in the host [col. 2, lines 54-64]. Therefore, Knight is directed towards discovering the network configuration, and Ito is directed towards communicating data over said network. These are not mutually exclusive ends – although Ito affords transparency to a switch during data communication, it would still be advantageous to use the method taught by Knight to allow a system manager determine the network topology in order to configure the network, add new devices, etc. [col. 2, lines 38-46]. Therefore, combining Knight with Ito would not defeat the intended purpose of Ito.

6. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that Knight and Ito do not teach or suggest retrieving requested configuration information to a requesting application. But Knight teaches an application program may request and receive configuration information about at least one component in the system [col. 3, lines 13-43]. Specifically, Knight teaches a local agent that maintains the configuration information [col. 3, lines 26-31]. The local agent receives a request from an application running on a central manager and returns the requested configuration information [col. 3, lines 31-33], substantially as claimed.

Art Unit: 2116

7. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that Knight and Ito do not teach or suggest the component information comprises a loop address. But Knight teaches a storage network [col. 2, lines 20-33]. In the Description of the Related Art section in the Disclosure, Applicant admits that a typical storage network uses the Fibre Channel Arbitrated Loop (FC-AL) protocol [page 1, lines 10-15]. Because component information in the FC-AL protocol comprises a loop address, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the component information used by the teachings of Knight as implemented in a FC-AL environment would likewise comprise a loop address, substantially as claimed.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2116

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Chang whose telephone number is (703) 305-4612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (703) 308-1159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ec
August 2, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'A' followed by a long horizontal line.

**A. ELAMIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**